## Debunking The Siyar-ul-Mutakherin's claim about Guru Teg Bahadurji's martydom

It seems we have till date neither located nor translated the *Akhbar-i-Darbar-i-Mualla* (The Royal Mughal Court News) relating to the martyrdom of Guru Teg Bahadur Sahib. Hence non-Sikh historians have relied on *Siyar-ul-Mutakhirin*, written by Sayyid Ghulam Husain in 1782, almost 107 years after the martyrdom.

Sayyid Ghulam Husain was a native of Bengal and wrote that Guru Tegh Bahadur Sahib and Hafiz Adam, a disciple of Shaikh Ahmad Sarhindi (contemporary of Jahangir, in one of his letter he had expressed great delight at the execution of 'Kafir of Goindwal', Guru Arjan Dev) had collected a large body of men and used to loot money from poor people.

Ghulam Hussain Khan left Delhi after Nader Shah's Sack of Delhi and moved to the court of his cousin, <u>Alivardi Khan</u>, the Nawab of Bengal, in Murshidabad.

Now pay attention to the account of Alivardi Khan (the Cousin of Ghulam Hussain Khan).

Originally Mirza Bande or Mirza Muhammad Ali, Alivardi was of Indian-Arab ancestry and a native of the Deccan who was born in 1676. His father Mirza Muhammad Madani, who was the son of a foster-brother of the Mughal emperor *Aurangzeb*.

From here, it can be interpretated that Ghulam Hussain and Aurangzeb were somewhere connected, so how can we trust someone sitting in Bengal

writing about Sikhs of Punjab that too 107 years later, why will he write something against the Mughals when his relatives were Mughals, why will he write something in favour of Hindus and Sikhs while he considered Hindus and Sikhs as kafirs). All this story told by Ghulam Hussain was a coverup and justification for the cruel murder of Guru Teg Bahadur and to make people think that he was not any martyr. Moreover, Ghulam Hussain never criticised Auranzeb for his ill-conceived religious policies, which further proves his support for the Emperor.

Saqi Must-id-Khan, a contemporary writer who wrote *Masir-e-Alamgiri* (translation by Sir Jadunath Sarkar, page 94) mentions an interesting incident "When he (Aurangzeb) alighted the boat and was about to get on the movable throne (Takhte-Rawan) an ill-fated disciple of Guru Tegh Bahadur threw two bricks on the Emperor, one of which hit the throne."

Khan; Muhammad Shuj'ā son of Qaiāmuddin Khan, came from Persia, had audience and was made a hazāri (300 tr.). An annual pension of 12,000 rupees was settled on 'Aqil Khan who had resigned his office and taken to a tite of retirement. Ibrāhim Khan [154] applied for resigning his mansab; it was granted. Iftikhār Khan was appointed faujdār of Bangashāt.

On Friday, the 27th October, 1676/29th Ramzan, while the Emperor was returning from the Jām'a mosque, and had alighted from the boat in order to mount the movable chair (takht-i-rawān), an ill-fated disciple of Guru Tegh Singh threw two bricks, one of which reached the chair. He was seized by the retinue and ordered to be made over to the kotwāl.

[RETURN OF THE EMPEROR FROM LAHORE TO DELHI]

On Thursday, the 24th February, 1676/19th Zil. H., the Emperor left Lahore. Kamāluddin, son of Dilir Khan was created a Khan. On 21st February/16th Zil. H., Dostdar Bānu Begam, wife of Muhammad Sultān, died in the sārāi of Rustam Khan. On Monday, the 27th March/

Obviously people were unhappy with the execution of Guru Tegh Bahadur and he was seen as a martyr by the people.

In addition to baseless allegations, Ghulam Husain made a grave error here by bracketing Guru Tegh Bahadur Sahib with Hafiz Adam. Hafiz Adam was banished by Shah Jahan in 1642, thirty-three years earlier. Hafiz went on a pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina where he died in 1643. Dr Ganda Singh in 1977 quoted several works (with page numbers) to prove the discrepancy of the year by Ghulam Husain and fallacy of his allegations.

- Kamal-ud-din Ahsan, Rauzat-ul-Qayumia, 178
- Nazir Ahmad, Tazkirat-ul-Abidin, 124-25
- Mirat-e-Jahan Nama 606
- Ghulam Nabi, Mirat-ul-Qwanin, 417
- Mirza Muhammad Akhtari. Tazkirah-e-Hind-o-Pakistan, 401

Sayyid Ghulam Husain had charged Guru Ji with plundering people. HR Gupta rightly says that on the very face of it this accusation appears false and baseless. Hafiz Ahmed was no way associated with Guru Teg Bahadur. It was a figment of his imagination.

For more details on the topic here's an article of a pro hindu organization about the topic

https://www.hindujagruti.org/news/538.html

#### **Martyrdom & Persian accounts**

There are a number of Persian accounts which mention the martyrdom of Guru Tegh Bahadur Sahib. The tone of the account ranges from neutral to negative. Readers have to bear in mind that any slightest critique of the Mughal Emperor would have resulted in death penalty for the author. Consequently some of them try to give justification for the execution. As a sample, I am producing three Persian accounts written few years after the martyrdom. They were initially translated by Dr Ganda Singh during his illustrious career but I have used a more recent translation from the book *Sikh History from Persian Sources*.

#### • Khulasat-ut-Tawarikh (1695)

Sujan Rai Bhandari's *Khulasat-ut-Tawarikh*, completed in 1695, is a history of India. The main account of the Sikhs and their history is given in the chapter on the province of Lahore. He mentions the martyrdom of Guru Tegh Bahadur without going into much detail lest he would have incurred the wrath of the Mughal ruler. He writes:

"Then Tegh Bahadur, the younger son of Guru Hargobind, occupied the seat for fifteen years. In the end, he was imprisoned under Imperial officers, and in 1081 A. H. (1670- 71AD), corresponding to the 17th regnal year of Alamgir (1673-74AD), he was executed at Shahjahanabad (Delhi) in accordance with Alamgir's orders. At the time of writing this book, Guru Gobind Rai, the son of Guru Tegh Bahadur, has been in occupation of the sacred seat for twenty-two years."

#### Nuskha-i Dilkusha (1709)

Another Persian account is Bhimsen's *Nuskha-i Dilkusha* (1709), is a history of Aurangzeb's reign, written largely in the form of memoirs. Bhimsen was an officer of Dalpat Rao Bundela (A Rajput & trusted military commander of Aurangzeb), who died at the battle of Jajau in June 1707. Bhimsen gives an account of that battle, at which he was present. He also refers to Guru Gobind Singh's meeting with Mughal Emperor Bahadur Shah, successor of Aurangzeb in 1708. In relation to Guru Tegh Bahadur, he writes: "Some of his descendants (of Guru Nanak) have been masters of mystic attainments and have adopted the way of poverty and humility. Many took to the path of rebellion, such as Tegh Bahadur, by name, who lived in the mountains near Sirhind: he got himself called King (Padshah), and a large body of people gathered around him. When the news was conveyed to His Majesty Emperor Alamgir (Aurangzeb), it was ordered that he should be brought to the Court. When he came to the Court, he was executed."

#### • Ibratnama (1719)

Muhammad Qasim in his *Ibratnama* (1719) refers to Guru Tegh Bahadur having come under the wrath of Aurangzeb to be condemned to death. He writes:

"the Emperor (Aurangzeb) had regard for royal power but he also associated with religious men. Some of the mystics aligned with him of their own accord. Others, like Sarmad, tasted martyrdom. Guru Tegh Bahadur was in the latter category. He was condemned not only for religious reasons but also because he lived in great splendour and his followers claimed sovereignty for him. In fact, a large number of people had begun to follow Guru Har Rai (who is wrongly mentioned as Guru Tegh Bahadur's father), and to glorify him."

#### **Conclusion**

Other non-contemporary Persian accounts which mention the martyrdom of Guru Tegh Bahadur are Guru Gobind Singh Ji's Bachitter Natak(1688) Gurbilas Patshahi 6 [1720], Gurbilas Patshahi 10 [1751] Bansavalinama [1769] Buddh Singh Arora's *Risala Dar-Ahwal-a-Nanak Shah Darvesh* (1783); Bakhat Mal's *Khalsanama*; Ganesh Dass Wadhera's *Charbagh-a-Punjab*; Khushwaqat Rai's *Twarikh-a Sikhan-wa Mulk-i-Punjab-wa-Malwa* (1840), Ghulam Mohiuddin Buteshah's *Tarikh-e-Punjab*, Shardha Ram Philori's, *Sikhan-De-Raj-Di-Vithia* (1867) and Kanahiya Lal's *Tarikha- Punjab*.

I have quoted a number of non-Sikh & Persian sources to disprove *Siyar-ul-Mutakhirin*. The original work was done by Fauja Singh, Ganda Singh, and Hari Ram Gupta among others which have been in the public domain for at least 40 years now. If someone continues to quote Sayyid Ghulam Husain's account written 107 years after Guru Tegh Bahadur's martyrdom and ignores the above accounts then either they need a lesson in history or they have a specific agenda.

Remembering an obscure Muslim who served Guru Tegh Bahadur during his last days. The Sikh Encyclopaedia by Dr Harbans Singh mentions Khwaja Abdulla, a native of Mani Majra (near Chandigarh) and the keeper of the jail at Chandni Chowk kotwali in Delhi, where Guru Tegh Bahadur was detained under the orders of Mughal Emperor. Khwaja was a pious man and respected Guru Ji. He tried to mitigate the rigour of Guru Ji's incarceration as far as his official position permitted. After Guru Tegh Bahadur's martyrdom, he resigned his post and went to live at Anandpur, where he served Guru Gobind Singh, as a physician. His son, Ghulam Abbas, served under Nawab Kapur Singh as a physician during *misl* times.

# When people say that there are no historical sources, they are simply lying.

Bansavalinama of 1769 has a beautiful passage speaking to the sacrifice of Guru Tegh Bahadur, upholding Righteousness [dharam], the ability to practice one's faith. The author throughout speaks to Aurangzeb's horrific policies oppressing the Hindus:

ਤੁਰਕ ਸੀ ਬਡਾ ਹਿੰਦਆਂ ਦਾ ਵੈਰੀ । ਆਪਣੇ ਪਖ ਮਜ਼ਬ ਦੀ ਪਈ ਸੀ ਬੇੜੀ ਉਸ ਦੇ ਪੈਰੀ । ਸੀਸ ਦਿਤਾ ਅਤੇ ਧਰਮ ਰਖ ਲਿਤਾ । ਐਸਾ ਕੰਮੂ ਗੁਰੂ ਤੇਗ ਬਹਾਦੁਰ ਹੈ ਸੀ ਕਿਤਾ । 892

Turks were the great enemies of the Hindus, obsessed with the partisanship of their religious jurisprudence [mazhab], the shackles on their feet. Such was the feat of Guru Tegh Bahadur, giving his head and upholding Righteousness [dharam].

ਚਾਰੇ ਬਰਨ ਗੁਰੂ ਕੇ ਪੰਥ ਵਿਚ ਹੈ ਆਏ । ਜੋ ਲਾਹੇ ਜੰਞੂ ਤਿਸ ਨੂੰ ਨਹੀਂ ਆਖਣਾ - ਪਾਏ । ਜੋ ਕੋਈ ਪਾਏ ਜੰਞੂ ਤਿਸ ਨੂੰ ਨਹੀਂ ਆਖਣਾ -ਲਾਹੂ ।893।

All four castes have come into the <u>Panth</u> of the Guru, if someone takes off their <u>Janeo</u>, to them you shouldn't say, "Wear it".

If someone wears the Janeo, to them you shouldn't say, "Take it off".

Bansavalinama [1769], author: Kesar Singh Chibbar Chapter 10, page 170

Chapter 4 has the heading 'Kashmiri Pandit', page 31 describes them crying in front of the Guru asking for help (in Gurbilas Padshahi Dasven by Kuir Singh):

### <sub>ਚੋਥਾ ਅਧਿਆਇ</sub> ਵਿਦਿਆ ਪ੍ਰਾਪਤੀ ਅਤੇ ਕਸ਼ਮੀਰੀ ਪੰਡਿਤ

ਦੋਹਰਾ। ਜਿਮ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਗੁਰ<sup>1</sup> ਹਰਿ ਪੁਰ<sup>2</sup> ਗਏ, ਕਥਾ ਚੋਥ ਮੈ ਧ੍ਯਾਇ। ਤੇਗ ਬਹਾਦਰ ਗੁਰ ਚਲਨ, ਸੂਨ ਜਾਂ ਪੰਕ ਨਸਾਇ ॥੧॥ [੧॥] ਚੋਪਈ। ਮਨੀ ਸਿੰਘ ਭਨ ਗਾਥ ਰਸਾਲਾ। ਮਿਲੈ ਸਭੈ ਗੁਰ ਸੋ ਸੁਖ ਸਾਲਾ। ਮਿਲ ਪਰਵਾਰ ਮੰਗਲੰ ਗਾਵੈ। ਬਦਨ³ ਪੇਖ ਆਤਿ ਹੀ ਬਿਗਸਾਵੈ ॥ [੨॥] ਗੁਰ ਕੀ ਮਾਤ ਬੁਲਾਇ ਸੁਨਾਤੀ। ਨੰਦਜ ਕੋ ਅਤਿ ਲਖ ਬਿਗਸਾਤੀ। ਤਬ ਪੂਰ ਕੀ ਆਈ ਸਭ ਨਾਰੀ। ਗਾਵਤ ਭਾਵਤ ਮੰਗਲਚਾਰੀ ॥ [੩॥] ਜੈ ਯੂਤ ਜੀਵੈ ਤਬ ਲੋਂ ਆਲੀ<sup>6</sup>। ਜਬ ਲੋਂ ਨਭ ਧਰ ਸੇਸ<sup>7</sup> ਸੁਖਾਲੀ। ਗੁਰ ਹਜੂਰ ਸਭ ਸੰਗਤ ਆਵੇਂ। ਜਨਮ ਕਥਾ ਸਭ ਛੋਰ ਸੁਨਾਵੈਂ॥ [੪॥] ਅਰਫ ਦੀਨ ਜਿਮ ਪੀਰ ਮਿਲਾਨਾ। ਦਾਰਾ ਪ੍ਰਸਨ ਕਥਾ ਅਤਿ ਨਾਨਾ। ਪੁਨਿ ਕਹਿ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਗੁਰ ਸੋ ਅਸ ਬਾਨੀ। ਏ ਹੈ ਪ੍ਰਸਨੋਤ੍ ਸੁਖ ਖਾਨੀ ॥ [੫॥] ਪੁਨਿ ਗੁਰ ਬੈਨ ਕਹੈ ਸੰਗਤ ਪੁਨਿ। "ਯਾ ਰੱਛਕ ਕਰਤਾਰ ਮਹਾਗੁਨ। ਪਰ ਧਨ ਪਾਹਨ, ਪਰ ਤ੍ਰਿਯ ਮਾਈ। ਏ ਹਮਰੇ ਕੁਲ ਹੋਤੀ ਆਈ ॥ [੬॥] ਵਿਦ੍ਯਾ ਆਗਮ⁰ ਨਿਗਮ⁰ ਨਿਹਾਰੇ। ਤਾ ਤੇ ਗੁਰਮਤਿ ਇਨੈ ਸਿਖਾਰੈ।" ਤਬ ਸੰਗਤ ਮਨ ਮੋਦ ਪ੍ਰਕਾਰੀ। ਸੇਵਤ ਹੈਂ ਗੁਰ ਬਿਬਿਧ ਪ੍ਰਕਾਰੀ ॥ [੭॥] ਚੋਸਠ ਵਿਦ੍ਯ<sup>11</sup> ਜੋ ਜਗਚਾਰੀ। ਸੀਖੀ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਗੁਰ<sup>12</sup> ਨਿਮਖ ਮੰਝਾਰੀ। ਤਬ ਸੰਗਤ ਤਨ ਐਸੇ ਬਾਨੀ। ਵਿਦ੍ਯਾ ਪਤਿ ਏ ਹੈਂ ਮਨ ਮਾਨੀ ॥੨॥ [੮॥] ਸਵੈਯਾ। ਸੰਗਤ ਆਵਤ ਦੇਸਨ ਦੇਸ ਤੇ, ਗਾਇ ਮੂਨੀ ਪ੍ਰਭ ਰੂਪ ਨਿਹਾਰੀ। ਸੰਗ ਅਯੋ ਇਕ ਦੇਸ ਕਸਮੀਰ ਰਹਿ, " ਆਨ ਗੁਰੂ ਪਦ ਬੰਦਨ ਧਾਰੀ। ਕੁਸਲ ਬੁਝੀ ਜਬ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਗੁਰ ਜੀ, ਤਬ ਰੋਵਤ ਨੈਨ ਕਹੀ ਕਥ ਸਾਰੀ। "ਹੈ ਪ੍ਭ ਤੂਟਤ ਬ੍ਯੂਹ ਜਨੇਵਨ,⁴ ਗਉਅਨ ਘਾਤ ਘਨੋਂ ਦੁਖ ਭਾਰੀ ॥੩॥ [੯॥]

Gurbilas Patshahi 6 [1720] matches with Gurbilas Patshahi 10 [1751] speaking how Aurangzeb was committing atrocities - ripping off sava mann

<sup>1.</sup> ਗੁਰੂ ਤੇਗ਼ ਬਹਾਦੁਰ ਜੀ। 2. ਸ਼ਰਗ। 3. ਮੂੰਹ (ਸ੍ਰੀ ਦਸ਼ਮੇਸ਼ ਜੀ ਦਾ)। 4. ਗੁਰੂ ਤੇਗ਼ ਬਹਾਦੁਰ ਜੀ ਦੀ ਮਾਤਾ ਨਾਨਕੀ। 5. ਨੰਦ (ਪੁਤ੍ਰ) ਦਾ ਬੇਟਾ (ਪੋਤ੍ਰਾ)। 6. ਸਖੀ, ਸਹੇਲੀ। 7. ਜਦ ਤਕ ਨਭ (ਆਕਾਸ਼) ਅਤੇ ਧਰਾ (ਧਰਤੀ) ਸ਼ੇਸ਼ (ਨਾਗ) ਦੇ ਸਿਰ ਉੱਤੇ ਕਾਇਮ ਹੈ। 8. ਦਾਰਾ ਸ਼ਿਕੋਹ। 9. ਵੇਦ। 10. ਸ਼ਾਸਤ੍ਰ। 11. ਚਾਰ ਵੇਦ, ਛੇ ਵੇਦਾਂਗ, ਨਯਾਯ, ਮੀਮਾਂਸਾ, ਪੁਰਾਣ, ਧਰਮ ਸ਼ਾਸਤ੍ਰ ਆਦਿ। 12. ਸ੍ਰੀ ਦਸ਼ਮੇਸ਼ ਜੀ। 13. ਕਸ਼ਮੀਰ ਦੀ ਸੰਗਤ ਆਈ। 14. ਜਨੇਊ ਸਰੀਰ ਤੋਂ ਤੋੜੇ ਜਾਂਦੇ ਹਨ।

[~50kg] worth of Janeus from the populace of Kashmir, and how Guru Tegh Bahadur sacrificed his life to protect the people

Pg. 281 Chp 8

#### ਚਪਾਈ

ਸੁਨਿ ਬਿਧੀਆ ਜਬ ਸ਼ਬਦ ਉਚਾਰੇ । ਉਰੰਗਜੇਬ ਪਤਿਸ਼ਾਹ ਬਿਚਾਰੇ । ਜਗ ਮਹਿ ਬਡੋ ਕਰੇ ਉਤਪਾਤ । ਗੋ ਦਿਜ ਕਾਂ ਵਹੁ ਕਰ ਹੈ ਘਾਤ । ਦ੍ਵਿਵਜ ਛੜ੍ਹੀ ਕਾ ਧਰਮ ਉਤਾਰੇ । ਜੰਞੂ ਤੌਰ ਦੀਨ ਨਿਜ ਧਾਰੇ । ਸਵਾ ਮਣਿ ਜੰਵੂ ਲਹਿ ਕਸ਼ਮੀਰ । ਤਬ ਛੜ੍ਹੀ ਦਿਜ ਹੋਇ ਅਧੀਟ ॥ 351 ॥

From Khulasat-ut-Tawarikh by Sujan Rai, 1695

74], 10 he was executed at Shāhjahānābād [Delhi] in accordance with 'Alamgīr's orders. At the time of writing this book, Gurū Gobind Rāi, 11 the son of Gurū Tegh Bahādur, has been in occupation of the sacred seat for twenty-two years.

The earliest mention of their deputation to Guru Tegh Bahadur is in Bhat Vahi Talaunda Pargana Jind (17thC). The head of the deputation, Kirpa Ram, later took Khande+Baate-Di-Pahul, became Kirpa Singh and died at the Battle of Chamkaur in 1705. Interestingly, once the arrest order had been given, Farrukh Siyar Nama (18thC) mentions it was kept a secret, likely to be actioned once the Mughals felt they could do it easily.

Sainapati presents a discursive tradition that departs radically from other contemporaneous writings like the *Bachitar Natak* (1696) that are often uncritically attributed to Guru Gobind Singh in Sikh scholarship. It is fascinating to see that Sainapati is aware of the *Bachitar Natak* and even uses it as a model, but departs from its theology and its liberal use of Hindu mythology. While the author of the *Bachitar Natak* finds it necessary to locate Guru Gobind Singh's lineage within the Vaishnava divine king Râma's Sun dynasty, Sainapati prefers to locate him within a distinct tradition that begins with Guru Nanak. If the author of the *Bachitar Natak* calls Guru Tegh Bahadur "hind dî châdar" (The protector of Hindustan), Sainapati universalizes the Guru's sacrifice by referring to him as the "jagat di châdar" (The protector of the world, Chapter 2, 5.46). The political dimension of Sainapati'stext—one that seeks political ascendancy of the Khalsa — is also largely missing from the *Bachitar Natak*. In this period, there

Then appeared Guru Tegh Bahadur on the firmament, Who sheltered the whole creation with his grace. He upheld the right to religious freedom and deeds. Which immortalised his Saga in the age of kalyuga<sup>4</sup>.||14||

His sacrifice came to be praised throughout the world. As he had safeguarded religious freedom all over, His deed came to be hailed in the three worlds<sup>5</sup>. As the Divine Lord had stood by the Divine Guru.||15||

The right to put Tilak<sup>6</sup>, wear Janeu<sup>7</sup> and sit in religious congregate Remained in practice permanently with Divine Guru's grace. As he departed for heavenly abode in the cause of religion,

Other contemporary sources like the Bhatt Vahis which were written near the Guru's death also confirm the location being Chandi Chowk (Delhi)

Bhat Vahi Talauda and Bhat Vahi Multani Sindhi (Punjabi University, Patiala). From the Bhat Vahi:

"Dayal Das beta Mai Das ka pota Balu ka parpota Mule ka Guru gailo sal satrai sai battis *Manghar Sudi* Panchmi ko Dilli Chandni Chowk ke malhan Shahi hukam gail mara gaya, sath Sati Das, Mati Das bete Hira Mal ke Bhagwat Gotre Chhibbar Brahmin mare gaye."

What is clear from early Sikh writings, including Bachitr Natak (1680s) and Sri GurSobha (1711), the Guru presented himself to the authorities for the sake of righteousness, to protect religious freedoms and gave his head to protect the honour of the innocents. After his arrest, Bhat Vahi Purbi Dakhani (17thC) mentions Guru ji was kept at Sirhind for 4 months. Bhat Vahi Multani Sindhi (17thC) mentions many atrocities committed against him. According to Guru Kian Sakhian (1790s), the Guru was eventually sent to Delhi in an iron cage.

Siyar-ul-Mutakhirin was written by Sayyid Ghulam Husain over a 100 years after in 1782, he gives Gwalior as the location of the Guru's death which as I showed above is not consistent with the other near contemporary Persian source that is much closer to the actual event:

Gualiar. The governor executed his orders promptly.

Some time after this, Tegh Bahadur suffered death;

and his body being cut into four quarters, was exposed at the four gates of the fortress of Gualiar.

After the executions of Bhais Mati Das, Dayal Das and Sati Das, Jalaludin of Samana then beheaded the Guru, as per Bhat Vahi Talaunda (17thC) and Bhat Vahi Multani Sindhi (17thC). Jalaludin was ritually beheaded by Jathedar Binod Singh after the Battle of Samana. Bachitr Natak (1680s) describes the tremendous deed of Guru ji in him giving his head for the sake of holy men and that he broke the earthen pitcher of his body on the head of the ruler of Delhi. While the world cried 'Alas, Alas, Alas', the heavens resounded with joy.

Thheekar forh dilees sir, Prabh pur keeaa payaan, Teg Bahadur see kirya, karee na kinahoo aan. Teg Bahaadur ke chalat, bhayo jagat ko sok, Hai hai hai sabh jag bhayo, jai jai jai sur lok.

Casting off his bodily vesture on the head of Suzerain Of Delhi; Teg Bahadur departed to the Realm of God.

None who came into the world performed such glorious deeds as him. On his

departure, there was dismay in the world. This world cried, "Alas, Alas" the Heavens echoed with greetings of victory.

#### [Guru Gobind Singh]

In Gur Sobha (1711), the sacrifices of the Sahibzades are also linked to that of Guru Tegh Bahadur. The sacrifice of Guru Tegh Bahadur was to uphold right of religious freedom and deeds. His execution clearly held a religious dimension for the Sikhs of that period. The impact the execution had on Sikhs is also mentioned in Maasir-i-Alamgiri (1710) from an incident whereby a Sikh of Guru Tegh Bahadur had thrown two bricks at Aurangzeb in 1676, was subsequently seized and handed over to the local Jagirdar at Kotwal.

Muslims say that the Guruji was killed because he plundered Punjab with one Hafiz Adam. But when Hafiz Adam died, the Guru was only eleven.

Hafyz Adeem (Banoori) left Hindustan and died at Medina in 1643 A.D. Therefore, his making a common cause with Guru Tegh Bahadur is historically wrong. For details see Nazeer Ahmad Deobandi, Tazkrat-ul-Abdin,

pp. 124-125; Maulvi Ghulam Nabi, Mirat-ul-Qaunain, p. 417; Mirza Muhammad Akhtar's Tazkara-i-Auliya-i-Hind-wa-Pakistan, p. 401; Saiyad Abdul Hayee Hasani Rai-Bareilvi, Nazzat-ul-Khwatir, vol. 5, pp. 1-2. Even otherwise, too, being a disciple of Mujadid Alf Sani, there was no possibility of his joining the Guru. For this information, I am thankful to Dr G.S. Anand.

Ghulam Husain is obviously in the wrong in bracketing Guru Tegh Bahadur with Hafiz Adam. Hafiz Adam was banished by Shah Jahan in 1642, thirty-three years earlier. The Hafiz went on a pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina where he died in 1643.<sup>2</sup>